

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
EASTERN DIVISION

GERALD L. CLEMONS, :
Petitioner, :
vs. : Case No. C-1-00-722
BETTY MITCHELL, WARDEN, : JUDGE GEORGE C. SMITH
Respondent. : MAGISTRATE JUDGE KING

GERALD CLEMONS' MERIT BRIEF
VOL. I

CHARLES L. WILLE (0056444)
Capital Crimes Section
30 East Broad Street, 23rd Floor
Columbus, Ohio 43215
(614) 728-7055

RICHARD S. KETCHAM (0023380)
755 South High Street
Columbus, Ohio 43206
(614) 444-3900

DAVID J. GRAEFF (0020647)
P.O. Box 1948
Westerville, Ohio 43086
(614) 226-5991

COUNSEL FOR RESPONDENT
STATE OF OHIO

COUNSEL FOR PETITIONER
GERALD CLEMONS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Table of Authorities.....	i
Procedural History.....	1
Facts.....	4
First Ground for Relief.....	12
<p>THE TRIAL COURT ERRED TO THE PREJUDICE OF PETITIONER CLEMONS WHEN IT DENIED A MOTION FOR CHANGE OF VENUE WHERE PRE-TRIAL PUBLICITY PRECLUDED THE ACCUSED FROM RECEIVING A FAIR TRIAL UNDER THE FOURTH, FIFTH, SIXTH, EIGHTH AND FOURTEENTH AMENDMENTS TO THE CONSTITUTION.</p>	
Second Ground for Relief.....	25
<p>THE TRIAL COURT ERRED TO THE PREJUDICE OF PETITIONER CLEMONS IN NOT GRANTING FUNDS FOR EXPERT ASSISTANCE CONSTITUTIONALLY REQUIRED FOR THE PREPARATION OF AN ADEQUATE DEFENSE AS GUARANTEED BY THE FIFTH, EIGHTH AND FOURTEENTH AMENDMENTS TO THE CONSTITUTION.</p>	
Third Ground for Relief.....	32
<p>PETITIONER GERALD CLEMONS WAS DENIED HIS RIGHT OF DUE PROCESS AND ASSISTANCE OF COUNSEL AS GUARANTEED BY THE SIXTH, EIGHTH AND FOURTEENTH AMENDMENTS TO THE CONSTITUTION BECAUSE THE RECORD REFLECTS TRIAL COUNSEL PROVIDED INEFFECTIVE ASSISTANCE TO PETITIONER CLEMONS.</p>	
Fourth Ground for Relief.....	45
<p>PROSECUTORIAL MISCONDUCT OCCURRED IN THIS CASE, SPECIFICALLY IN THE OPENING STATEMENT, CLOSING ARGUMENT AND THE PENALTY PHASE PROCEEDINGS WHICH RESULTED IN PREJUDICE TO PETITIONER CLEMONS TO THE EXTENT THAT HE WAS DENIED A FAIR TRIAL UNDER THE FOURTH, FIFTH, SIXTH, EIGHTH AND FOURTEENTH AMENDMENTS TO THE CONSTITUTION.</p>	

Fifth Ground for Relief..... 61

THE TRIAL COURT ERRED IN SENTENCING WHEN IMPROPERLY CONSIDERING THE NATURE AND CIRCUMSTANCES OF THE OFFENSE AS AN AGGRAVATING CIRCUMSTANCE IN IMPOSING THE DEATH SENTENCE ON PETITIONER CLEMONS, THE RESULT BEING CONTRA THE EIGHTH AND FOURTEENTH AMENDMENTS TO THE CONSTITUTION.

Sixth Ground for Relief..... 67

THE TRIAL COURT ERRED TO THE PREJUDICE OF PETITIONER CLEMONS WHEN IT DENIED THE PRE-TRIAL MOTION FOR TWELVE PEREMPTORY JURY CHALLENGES CONTRA THE SIXTH, EIGHTH AND FOURTEENTH AMENDMENTS TO THE CONSTITUTION.

Seventh Ground for Relief..... 72

THE DEATH PENALTY STATUTE IN OHIO IS UNCONSTITUTIONAL UNDER THE FOURTH, SIXTH, EIGHTH AND FOURTEENTH AMENDMENTS TO THE CONSTITUTION IN THAT IT FAILS TO REQUIRE THE APPROPRIATE MENTAL STATE AND, AS A RESULT, ALLOWS THE JURY TO CONVICT ON A LESS THAN ADEQUATE SHOWING OF CULPABILITY.

Eighth Ground for Relief..... 76

PETITIONER CLEMONS WAS IMPROPERLY CONVICTED AND SENTENCED BECAUSE THE OHIO BEYOND A REASONABLE DOUBT STANDARD FAILS TO MEET THE REQUIREMENT OF A HIGHER RELIABILITY FOR GUILT DETERMINATION IN A CAPITAL CASE CONTRA THE FIFTH, SIXTH, EIGHTH AND FOURTEENTH AMENDMENTS TO THE CONSTITUTION.

Ninth Ground for Relief..... 80

THE AMENDED OHIO REVIEW PROCESS IS UNCONSTITUTIONAL IN VIOLATION OF THE EIGHTH AND FOURTEENTH AMENDMENTS TO THE CONSTITUTION IN THAT IT REMOVES COURT OF APPEALS JURISDICTION FROM THE DIRECT APPEAL PROCESS.

Tenth Ground for Relief..... 86

THE OHIO DEATH PENALTY STATUTES ARE UNCONSTITUTIONAL IN THAT THEY VIOLATE THE EIGHTH AMENDMENT PROSCRIPTION OF CRUEL AND UNUSUAL PUNISHMENT AND THE FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION WHICH GUARANTEES DUE PROCESS OF LAW AND EQUAL PROTECTION OF THE LAWS.

Eleventh Ground for Relief..... 96

THE REQUIREMENT THAT A JURY MUST RECOMMEND DEATH UPON PROOF BEYOND A REASONABLE DOUBT THAT THE AGGRAVATING CIRCUMSTANCES OUTWEIGH ONLY TO THE SLIGHTEST DEGREE THE MITIGATING CIRCUMSTANCES GIVES THE OHIO CAPITAL STATUTES A MANDATORY NATURE, THUS PERMITTING THE EXECUTION OF AN ACCUSED EVEN THOUGH THE MITIGATING EVIDENCE FALLS JUST SHORT OF EQUIPOISE WITH THE AGGRAVATING FACTORS. THE RESULT IS THE OHIO STATUTE RENDERS THE CAPITAL PROCESS ARBITRARY AND CAPRICIOUS CONTRA THE SIXTH, EIGHTH AND FOURTEENTH AMENDMENTS TO THE CONSTITUTION.

Twelfth Ground for Relief..... 100

THE PROVISIONS OF OHIO CRIM. R. 11(c)(3), PERMITTING THE TRIAL COURT TO DISMISS SPECIFICATIONS UPON A GUILTY PLEA UNDER THE CONCEPT OF "IN THE INTEREST OF JUSTICE" NEEDLESSLY ENCOURAGES GUILTY PLEAS, THUS RE-INTRODUCING THE POSSIBILITY THAT THE DEATH SENTENCE WILL BE IMPOSED ARBITRARILY AND CAPRICIOUSLY CONTRA THE EIGHTH AND FOURTEENTH AMENDMENTS TO THE CONSTITUTION.

Thirteenth Ground for Relief..... 103

THE OHIO CAPITAL SENTENCING SCHEME IS UNCONSTITUTIONAL IN THAT IT PROVIDES NO STANDARD FOR SENTENCING OR REVIEW AT THE SIGNIFICANT STAGES OF THE APPELLATE PROCESS AND, AS A RESULT, THE DEATH SENTENCE OF GERALD CLEMONS WAS IMPOSED AND REVIEWED WITHOUT SUFFICIENT GUIDANCE TO JURIES, THE TRIAL-SENTENCING JUDGE AND OHIO REVIEW IN COURTS. THIS RESULTS IN THE ARBITRARY AND CAPRICIOUS INFLICTION OF THE DEATH PENALTY CONTRA THE SIXTH,

EIGHTH AND FOURTEENTH AMENDMENTS TO THE
CONSTITUTION.

Fourteenth Ground for Relief..... 105

WHERE THE RECORD REVEALS THAT THE
SENTENCING JUDGE CONSIDERED AND WEIGHED
IMPROPER AGGRAVATING CIRCUMSTANCES WHEN
IMPOSING THE DEATH PENALTY, THE RESULTING
SENTENCE IS CONTRA THE SIXTH, EIGHTH AND
FOURTEENTH AMENDMENTS TO THE
CONSTITUTION.

Fifteenth Ground for Relief..... 109

THE TRIAL COURT ERRED IN PERMITTING THE
PROSECUTOR TO HAVE AN EXPERT TESTIFY ON
THE AFFECTS OF PROZAC WHEN THE DEFENSE
HAD NOT RAISED, DURING THE COURSE OF THE
JURY TRIAL, AN INSANITY DEFENSE CONTRA
THE FOURTH, FIFTH, SIXTH, EIGHTH AND
FOURTEENTH AMENDMENTS TO THE
CONSTITUTION.

Sixteenth Ground for Relief..... 112

WHERE A CONVICTION IS BASED UPON
INSUFFICIENT EVIDENCE, ON THE AGGRAVATED
MURDER COUNTS, THE RESULT IS CONTRA THE
DUE PROCESS CLAUSE OF THE FOURTEENTH
AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION AND THE
SIXTH AND EIGHTH AMENDMENTS TO THE
CONSTITUTION.

Seventeenth Ground for Relief..... 114

THE TRIAL COURT ERRS TO THE PREJUDICE OF
PETITIONER CLEMONS WHEN THE COURT REFERS
TO THE JURY'S DECISION AS RECOMMENDATION,
THEREBY DIMINISHING THE JURY'S SENSE OF
RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE DECISION IN
VIOLATION OF THE SIXTH, EIGHTH AND
FOURTEENTH AMENDMENTS TO THE
CONSTITUTION.

Conclusion..... 118

Proof of Service..... 119

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	<u>Page</u>
<u>Ake v. Oklahoma</u> (1985) 470 U.S. 68; 105 S.Ct. 1087.....	26
<u>Allen v. Morris</u> 845 F.2d 610 (6 th Cir. 1988).....	111
<u>Apprendi v. New Jersey</u> 530 U.S. 466, 120 S.Ct. 2348, 147 L.Ed.2d 435 (2000).....	74
<u>Arave v. Creech</u> (1993) 507 U.S. 463.....	64
<u>Barclay v. Florida</u> (1983) 463 U.S. 939.....	63
<u>Bell v. Ohio</u> 438 U.S. 637, 98 S.Ct. 2977 (1978).....	101
<u>Blystone v. Pennsylvania</u> (1990) 494 U.S. 299, 110 S.Ct. 1078.....	98
<u>Brecht v. Abrahamson</u> 507 U.S. 619, 113 S.Ct. 1710 (1993).....	51
<u>Buchanan v. Angelone</u> 522 U.S. at 277, 118 S.Ct. 757.....	50
<u>State v. Buell</u> (1986) 22 Ohio St. 3d 124, 489 N.E.2d 795.....	115
<u>United States v. Byers</u> 740 F.2d 1104 (D.C. Cir. 1984).....	28
<u>Cage v. Louisiana</u> (1990) 498 U.S. 39; 111 S.Ct. 328.....	79
<u>Caldwell v. Mississippi</u> 472 U.S. 320 (1985).....	48
<u>State v. Carter</u> (1995) 72 Ohio St. 3d 545, 651 N.E.2d 965.....	115
<u>Corbitt v. New Jersey</u> 439 U.S. 212, 99 S.Ct. 492 (1979).....	101
<u>Darden v. Wainwright</u> (1986) 477 U.S. 168; 106 S.Ct. 2464.....	46

<u>State v. Davis</u> (1988) 38 Ohio St. 3d 361.....	62
<u>DePew v. Anderson</u> 311 F.3d 742 (6 th Cir. 2003).....	22
<u>Dobbert v. Florida</u> 432 U.S. 282, 97 S.Ct. 2290 (1977).....	15
<u>Enmund v. Florida</u> (1982) 458 U.S. 872, 102 S.Ct. 3368.....	72
<u>Franklin v. Lynaugh</u> 487 U.S. 164; 108 S.Ct. 2320 (1988).....	77
<u>Furman v. Georgia</u> (1972) 408 U.S. 238, 92 S.Ct. 2726.....	81
<u>Gardner v. Florida</u> 430 U.S. 349.....	94
<u>Glenn v. Tate</u> 71 F.3d 1204 (6 th Cir. 1995).....	27
<u>State v. Goff</u> (1998) 82 Ohio St. 3d 123.....	87
<u>State v. Greer</u> (1988) 39 Ohio St. 3d 236; 530 N.E. 2d 382.....	68
<u>Gregg v. Georgia</u> 428 U.S. 153 (1976).....	65
<u>Griffin v. California</u> 380 U.S. 609, 85 S.Ct. 1229 (1965).....	51
<u>Harrison v. United States</u> 163 U.S. 140.....	71
<u>State v. Henness</u> (1997) 79 Ohio St. 3d 53, 679 N.E.2d 686.....	110
<u>Irving v. Dowd</u> (1961) 366 U.S. 717, 81 S.Ct. 1639.....	13
<u>United States v. Jackson</u> 390 U.S. 570, 88 S.Ct. 1209 (1968).....	101
<u>Jackson v. Virginia</u> (1979) 443 U.S. 307, 99 S.Ct. 2781.....	112
<u>Lewis v. Jeffers</u> 497 U.S. 764 (1990).....	65
<u>State v. Jenkins</u> (1984) 15 Ohio St. 3d 164, 473 N.E.2d 764.....	76

<u>Kelly v. South Carolina</u> (2002) 534 U.S. 246, 122 S.Ct. 726.....	87
<u>Lewis v. United States</u> 146 U.S. 370.....	70
<u>Lockett v. Ohio</u> 438 U.S. 586, 98 s.cT. 2954 (1978)...	101
<u>Lockhart v. McCree</u> (1986) 476 U.S. 162, 106 S.Ct. 1758.....	77
<u>State v. Loza</u> (1994) 71 Ohio St. 3d 61.....	92
<u>State v. Lundgren</u> (1995) 73 Ohio St. 3d 474.....	38
<u>State v. Mapes</u> (1985) 19 Ohio St. 3d 108, 484 N.E.2d 140.....	73
<u>State v. Maurer</u> (1984) 15 Ohio St. 3d 239, 473 N.E.2d 768.....	38
<u>Smith v. Mills</u> (1992) 62 Ohio St. 3d 357, 582 N.E.2d 972.....	87
<u>Morgan v. Illinois</u> 504 U.S. 719 (1992).....	16
<u>Mu'Min v. Virginia</u> 500 U.S. 415 (1991).....	17
<u>In re Murchison</u> 349 U.S. 133.....	71
<u>Murphy v. Florida</u> 421 U.S. 794 (1975).....	15
<u>Nevers v. Killinger</u> 169 F.3d 352 (6 th Cir. 1999).....	24
<u>Patton v. Yount</u> 467 U.S. 1025 (1984).....	18
<u>Payne v. Tennessee</u> (1991) 501 U.S. 808.....	107
<u>Pointer v. United States</u> 151 U.S. 396.....	71
<u>Powell v. Collins</u> (6 th Cir. 2003) 332 F.3d 376.....	26
<u>California v. Ramos</u> 463 U.S. at 998-99, 103 S.Ct. at 3451.....	116
<u>Rideau v. Louisiana</u> (1963) 373 U.S. 723, 83 S.Ct. 1417.....	14

<u>Ring v. Arizona</u> 536 U.S. 584, 122 S.Ct. 2428, 153 L.Ed.2d 556 (2002).....	75
<u>Ristaino v. Ross</u> 424 U.S. 584 (1976).....	17
<u>Roberts v. Louisiana</u> (1976) 428 U.S. 325.....	97
<u>Sattazahn v. Pennsylvania</u> 537 U.S. 101, 123 S.Ct. 732 (2003).....	74
<u>Simmons v. South Carolina</u> (1994) 512 U.S. 154, 114 S.Ct. 2187.....	88
<u>Skaggs v. Parker</u> 235 F.3d 261 (6 th Cir. 2001).....	33
<u>Skipper v. South Carolina</u> 476 U.S. 1.....	94
<u>United States v. Sloan</u> 776 F.2d 926 (10 th Cir. 1985)..	28
<u>Smith v. McCormick</u> 914 F.2d 1153 (9 th Cir. 1990).....	28
<u>State v. Smith</u> (1997) 80 Ohio St. 3d 89, 684 N.E.2d 668.....	80
<u>Starr v. A.L. Lockhart</u> 23 F.3d 1280 (8 th Cir. 1994)...	28
<u>State v. Steffen</u> (1994) 70 Ohio St. 3d 399, 639 N.E.2d 67.....	84
<u>Stilson v. United States</u> (1919) 250 U.S. 583.....	68
<u>Strickland v. Washington</u> (1984) 466 U.S. 668; 104 S.Ct. 2052.....	42
<u>Swain v. Alabama</u> (1965) 380 U.S. 202.....	69
<u>State v. Taylor</u> (1997) 78 Ohio St. 3d 15, 676 N.E.2d 82.....	112
<u>State v. Watson</u> 61 Ohio St. 3d 1; 572 N.E.2d 97 (1991).....	76
<u>In re Winship</u> 397 U.S. 358, 25 L.Ed.2d 368, 90 S.Ct. 1068.....	79
<u>United States v. Young</u> 470 U.S. 1 (1985).....	47

<u>Zant v. Stephens</u> (1983) 462 U.S. 862, 103 S.Ct. 2733.....	63
---	----